



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Am

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/050,515	01/18/2002	Thomas Layne Bascom	12038	7770

38598 7590 06/28/2005

ANDREWS KURTH L.L.P.
1701 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 300
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

STEVENS, ROBERT

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 06/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/050,515

Applicant(s)

BASCOM ET AL.

Examiner

Robert M Stevens

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-57 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-57 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 April 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed 4/5/2005 to the original application filed 11/8/2002 by Bascom et al. entitled "System and Method for Collecting, Storing, Managing and Providing Categorized Information Related to a Document Object".
2. The Office withdraws the objections to the drawings and specification raised in the First Action on the Merits (FAOM), in view of the amendment.
3. The Office maintains the FAOM rejections of claims 1, 4, 6-13, 15-23, 26-27, 37-40, 43, 45-51 and 53-57 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goerz in view of Eddy, in view of the amendment.
4. The Office maintains the FAOM rejections of claims 2-3, 14, 41-42 and 52 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goerz in view of Eddy and in further view of Li, in view of the amendment.
5. The Office maintains the FAOM rejections of claims 5, 24-25, 28-36 and 44 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goerz in view of Eddy and in further view of Chang, in view of the amendment.
6. Claims 1-57 are pending. Claims 1, 21 and 40 are independent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. **Claims 1, 4, 6-13, 15-23, 26-27, 37-40, 43, 45-51 and 53-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Goerz, Jr. et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0065671, filed Jan. 30, 2001 and claiming benefit of CIP filing date of Sep. 12, 2000, hereafter referred to as "Goerz") in view of Sandra E. Eddy et al. (Teach Yourself XML, IDG Books Worldwide, Inc., Foster City, CA, (c) 1999, hereafter referred to as "Eddy").

Regarding independent claim 1, Goerz discloses:

A method for enabling users of a network to create, store, and provide access to relationships among document objects stored on the network, the method comprising the steps of:

*storing the link relationship in one or more link directories; ([0071] re: supercategories and subcategories) and
accessing one or more link relationships stored in the one or more link directories using a link identifier. ([0007] re: no discrimination among users of prior art browsers).*

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

allowing a user of the network to create a link relationship between a first document object and a second document object;

Eddy, though, discloses:

allowing creation of a link relationship between a first document object and a second document object; (p. 311, code listing 21-10, especially ‘ href=’/regions/nyc.xml’ ’)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz, because to do so would enable a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by Eddy in the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

*wherein the allowing step comprises:
locating a first document object;
locating a second document object related to the first document object in some manner determined by the first user; and
creating a link relationship between the first document object and the second document object.*

Eddy, though, discloses:

*wherein the allowing step comprises:
locating a first document object; (p. 311 listing 21-10, re: the current document)
locating a second document object related to the first document object in some manner determined by the first user; (p. 311 listing 21-10, re: selection of the link [i.e., document] “nyc.xml”) and
creating a link relationship between the first document object and the second document object. (p. 311 listing 21-10, re: ‘ href=’regions/nyc.xml’ ’)*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz, because to do so would enable a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by Eddy in the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Regarding claim 6, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the storing step comprises:
storing a link relationship entry in a link relationship table, wherein the link relationship entry comprises fields including a first link reference to the first document object and a second link reference to the second document object;
assigning link relationship attributes to the link relationship entry; and
setting a directional indicator for the link relationship entry.

Eddy, though, discloses:

wherein the storing step comprises:
storing a link relationship entry in a link relationship table, wherein the link relationship entry comprises fields including a first link reference to the first document object (p. 311 listing 21-10, re: the link to "nyc.xml") and a second link reference to the second document object; (p. 311 listing 21-10, re: the current document)
assigning link relationship attributes to the link relationship entry; (p. 311 listing 21-10, re: the link to "nyc.xml") and
setting a directional indicator for the link relationship entry. (p. 311 listing 21-10, re: "regions" link relationship entity of 1st line and href code assigning link references)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz, because to do so

would enable a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by Eddy in the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Regarding claim 7, which is dependent upon claim 6, the limitations of claim 6 have been previously addressed.

Goerz also discloses:

wherein the step of storing the link relationship in one or more link directories further comprises:

storing the first link reference to the first document object in a document object table; ([0041], re: indexed knowledge base 38 and supercategories)

storing the second link reference to the second document object in a document object table; ([0041], re: indexed knowledge base 38 and supercategories) and

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

assigning document object attributes to the first link reference associated with the first document object;

assigning document object attributes to the second link reference associated with the second document object.

Eddy, though, discloses:

assigning document object attributes to the first link reference associated with the first document object; (p. 311, listing 21-10 first title attribute set to "New York City")

assigning document object attributes to the second link reference associated with the second document object. (p. 311, listing 21-10 second title attribute set to "Long Island")

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz, because to do so

Art Unit: 2176

would enable a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by Eddy in the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent upon claim 7, the limitations of claim 7 have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

*wherein one or more of the link relationship attributes are set; and
a directional indicator for the link relationship attribute is set by
associating one document object attribute for the first link reference with
one document object attribute for the second link reference.*

Eddy, though, discloses:

*wherein one or more of the link relationship attributes are set; (p.
311 listing 21-10, re: set of href assignment statements) and
a directional indicator for the link relationship attribute is set by
associating one document object attribute for the first link reference with one
document object attribute for the second link reference. (p. 311 listing 21-10, link
direction set via href statements)*

It would have been¹ obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz, because to do so would enable a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by Eddy in the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Regarding claim 9, which is dependent upon claim 4, the limitations of claim 4 have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

further comprising displaying to a user a link reference to a document object related to a document object the user is currently accessing, wherein the link reference displayed to the user is determined by identifying those link relationships stored in the one or more link directories that include a link reference to a network address of the currently accessed document object. (Fig. 19I and [0095] discussing collaboration)

Regarding claim 10, which is dependent upon claim 9, the limitations of claim 9 have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

wherein the displaying step comprises displaying more than one link reference from one or more link directories. (Fig. 19I, the display of more than one company reference)

Regarding claim 11, which is dependent upon claim 9, the limitations of claim 9 have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

wherein the displaying step comprises sorting and presenting one or more link references by the one or more link directories storing the link references. (Fig. 19 E, search results numbered 1-6 are sorted alphabetically and displayed)

Regarding claim 12, which is dependent upon claim 11, the limitations of claim 11 have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

wherein the displaying step comprises sorting and presenting the one or more link references by attributes of the link relationships and link references. (Fig. 19 I, companies are sorted by type)

Regarding claim 13, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

wherein the method is used on one or more of: a private network, a closed network, a public network, and a private network that is connected to a public network. (Fig. 1 #10, the Internet [a public network])

Regarding claim 15, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

wherein the one or more link directories may be stored on a server connected to the network by means of a secure connection. (Fig. 1 #2, and security discussions in [0037], [0013] and [0095])

Regarding claim 16, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

further comprising assigning attributes to the link relationship established between the first document object and the second document object.

Eddy, though, discloses:

further comprising assigning attributes to the link relationship established between the first document object and the second document object. (p. 311 listing 21-10, second code line re: New York Regions title attribute assigned to regions extended link [i.e., link relationship])

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz, because to do so would enable a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by Eddy in the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Regarding claim 17, which is dependent upon claim 16, the limitations of claim 16 have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

further comprising assigning attributes to a first link reference to the first document object and a second link reference to the second document object.

Eddy, though, discloses:

further comprising assigning attributes to a first link reference to the first document object and a second link reference to the second document object. (p. 311 listing 21-10, re: title=New York City, and href=/regions/li.xml)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz, because to do so would enable a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by Eddy in the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Regarding claim 18, which is dependent upon claim 16, the limitations of claim 16 have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

wherein the link relationship stored in the one or more link directories may be organized, sorted, searched and filtered by one or more attributes assigned to the link relationships. (Fig. 19 I, organize, sort, search and filter by company type)

Regarding claim 19, which is dependent upon claim 17, the limitations of claim 17 have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

wherein the link references stored in the one or more link directories may be organized, sorted, searched and filtered by one or more attributes assigned to the link references. (Fig. 19 I, organize, sort, search and filter by company type)

Regarding claim 20, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

further comprising displaying one or more link references to document objects on the network comprises:

*selecting the displayed link references for display based on a link relationship to the currently displayed document object; and
filtering the displayed link references by attributes.*

Eddy, though, discloses:

wherein the step of providing one or more link references to document objects on the network comprises:

selecting the displayed link references for display based on a link relationship to the currently displayed document object; (p. 309 listing 21-8, link relationship set using href) and

filtering the displayed link references by attributes. (p. 309 listing 21-8, upon link traversal play sound according to the assigned attribute)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz, because to do so would enable a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by Eddy in the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Regarding independent claim 21, Goerz discloses:

A system for establishing and providing access to relationships between document projects stored on a network wherein the relationship between a first document object and a second document object may be created by an individual user of the network and provided to other users of the network, the system comprising:

*one or more client devices (Fig. 1 # 16A) that access document objects stored on the network (Fig. 1 # 10) ... ; and
one or more servers (Fig. 1 #2) that store ... created by the client devices (Fig. 1 # 16A) and transmit (Fig. 1 path from #10 to #16A) ... to the client devices. (Fig. 1 # 16A).*

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

*...and allow creation of link relationships between document objects ...
... the link relationships ... allow access to one or more stored link relationships using a unique identifier for a document object ... one or more link relationships and link references*

Eddy, though, discloses:

... and allow creation of link relationships between document objects ... (p. 311 listing 21-10, re: href assignments)

Art Unit: 2176

... the link relationships (p. 311 listing 21-10, re: href assignments) ... allow access to one or more stored link relationships using a unique identifier for a document object ... one or more link relationships and link references (p. 311 listing 21-10, re: href assignments and creation of extended link)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz, because to do so would enable a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by Eddy in the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Regarding claim 22, which is dependent upon claim 21, the limitations of claim 21 have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

wherein the one or more servers filter and sort the link relationships and link references before transmitting the link relationships and link references to the client devices. (Fig. 19E, search results numbered 1-6 are filtered/sorted alphabetically and displayed. When/where sorting - a topic in every computer science data structure class - takes place is irrelevant from a patentability standpoint.)

Regarding claim 23, which is dependent upon claim 21, the limitations of claim 21 have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

wherein the client devices filter and sort the link relationships and link references after the link relationships and link references are transmitted to the client devices from the one or more servers. (Fig. 19 E, search results numbered 1-6 are sorted alphabetically and displayed. When/where sorting - a topic in every computer science data structure class - takes place is irrelevant from a patentability standpoint.)

Regarding claim 26, which is dependent upon claim 21, the limitations of claim 21 have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

wherein the one or more client devices comprise:

a client tool, wherein the client tool comprises a graphic user interface display; ([0093])

a rendering tool that renders and displays document objects (Fig. 16 C), the rendering tool comprising:

a graphic user interface display ([0100], re: screen shots); and

a document object network address ([0095], re: group collaborations and access to Internet resources); and

a network access tool that connects the rendering tool and the client tool to the network. ([0094], re: online activities)

Regarding claim 27, which is dependent upon claim 26, the limitations of claim 26 have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

wherein the document object network address comprises a Uniform Resource Locator. ([0095], re: URL)

Claim 37 is substantially similar to claim 13, and therefore likewise rejected.

Claim 38 is substantially similar to claim 14, and therefore likewise rejected.

Claim 39 is substantially similar to claim 15, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding independent claim 40, Goerz discloses:

Art Unit: 2176

A computer readable medium upon which is embedded instructions for carrying out a method for enabling users of a network to create, store, and provide access to relationships among document objects stored on the network, the method comprising the steps of:

*storing the link relationship in one or more link directories; ([0071] re: supercategories and subcategories) and
accessing one or more link relationships stored in the one or more link directories using a unique identifier for a document object. ([0007] re: no discrimination among users of prior art browsers).*

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

allowing creation of a link relationship between a first document object and a second document object;

Eddy, though, discloses:

allowing a user of the network to create a link relationship between a first document object and a second document object; (p. 311, code listing 21-10, especially ' href="/regions/nyc.xml" ')

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz, because to do so would enable a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by Eddy in the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Claim 43 is substantially similar to claims 4, and therefore likewise rejected.

Claims 45-51 are substantially similar to claims 6-12, respectively, and therefore likewise rejected.

Claims 53-57 are substantially similar to claims 15-19, respectively, and therefore likewise rejected.

9. **Claims 2-3, 14, 41-42 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Goerz, Jr. et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0065671, filed Jan. 30, 2001 and claiming benefit of CIP filing date of Sep. 12, 2000, hereafter referred to as "Goerz") in view of Sandra E. Eddy et al. (Teach Yourself XML, IDG Books Worldwide, Inc., Foster City, CA, (c) 1999, hereafter referred to as "Eddy") and further in view of Li (US No. 6,725,227, provisionally filed Oct. 2, 1998, hereafter referred to as "Li").

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the accessing step comprises providing access only to authorized users.

Li, though, discloses:

wherein the providing step comprises providing access only to authorized users. (col. 1 lines 53-56, re: access control)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Li for the benefit of Goerz in view of Eddy, because to do so would allow users in a business environment to control access to information by individuals, projects and departments, as taught by Li in col. 1 lines 53-56. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

further comprising authorizing users of the network to perform the allowing, storing and accessing steps.

Li, though, discloses:

further comprising authorizing users of the network to perform the allowing, storing and providing steps. (col. 1 lines 53-56, re: access control)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Li for the benefit of Goerz in view of Eddy, because to do so would allow users in a business environment to control access to information by individuals, projects and departments, as taught by Li in col. 1 lines 53-56. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Regarding claim 14, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the one or more link directories are accessible only by a specific individual user of a client device.

Li, though, discloses:

wherein the one or more link directories are accessible only by a specific individual user of a client device. (col. 1 lines 53-56, re: access control)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Li for the benefit of Goerz in view of Eddy, because to do so would allow users in a business environment to control access to information by individuals, projects and departments, as taught by Li in col. 1 lines 53-56. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Claim 41 is substantially similar to claim 2, and therefore likewise rejected.

Claim 42 is substantially similar to claim 3, and therefore likewise rejected.

Claim 52 is substantially similar to claim 14, and therefore likewise rejected.

10. **Claims 5, 24-25, 28-36 and 44** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goerz, Jr. et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0065671,

filed Jan. 30, 2001 and claiming benefit of CIP filing date of Sep. 12, 2000, hereafter referred to as "Goerz") in view of Sandra E. Eddy et al. (Teach Yourself XML, IDG Books Worldwide, Inc., Foster City, CA, (c) 1999, hereafter referred to as "Eddy") and further in view of Chang (US No. 5,694,594, issued Dec. 2, 1997, hereafter referred to as "Chang").

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent upon claim 4, the limitations of claim 4 have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

wherein one or more of the steps of the method are accomplished by automated procedures not requiring interaction with the user.

Chang, though, discloses:

wherein one or more of the steps of the method are accomplished by automated procedures not requiring interaction with the user. (Abstract discloses the automatic generation of links)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Chang for the benefit of Goerz in view of Eddy, because to do so would allow a user to control the generation of links as taught by Chang in col. 8 lines 61-63. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Regarding claim 24, which is dependent upon claim 21, the limitations of claim 21 have been previously addressed.

Georz further discloses:

wherein the one or more servers comprise:

one or more link directories that store the link relationships created on the one or more client devices; ([0071], re: supercategories and subcategories)

a server manager module that coordinates communication ([0069], re: content management tool) between the one or more link directories ([0069], re: indexed knowledge base 38, which is used in conjunction with the content management tool), a user directory ([0057], re: user account on Website), ... , and the one or more client devices (Fig. 1 # 16A) if those client devices are requesting services from the server (Fig. 1 # 2); and

a user data store that stores information regarding authorized users of the servers and link directories ([0041], re: indexed knowledge base 38 and supercategories) and

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

a database of user profile data

Chang, though, discloses:

a database of user profile data (Abstract discloses the use of a user profile)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Chang for the benefit of Goerz in view of Eddy, because to do so would allow a user to control the generation of links as taught by Chang in col. 8 lines 61-63. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Regarding claim 25, which is dependent upon claim 24, the limitations of claim 24 have been previously addressed.

Georz further discloses:

Art Unit: 2176

wherein the user data store comprises:

a user directory, the user directory comprising one or more user data records containing personal identifying information and information regarding which of the one or more link directories and the one or more servers a user may be authorized to access; ([0057], especially re: user account)

a user account store, the user account store comprising one or more user account records each containing usage data for each authorized user of the servers and link directories ([0057], especially re: user account) and

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

a user profile store, the user profile store comprising one or more user profile records each containing one or more user profiles for each authorized user of the servers and link directories;

Chang, though, discloses:

a user profile store, the user profile store comprising one or more user profile records each containing one or more user profiles for each authorized user of the servers and link directories; (Abstract discloses the use of a user profile)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Chang for the benefit of Goerz in view of Eddy, because to do so would allow a user to control the generation of links as taught by Chang in col. 8 lines 61-63. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Regarding claim 28, which is dependent upon claim 26, the limitations of claim 26 have been previously addressed.

Georz further discloses:

wherein the one or more servers comprise:

one or more link directories that store the link relationships; ([0071], re: supercategories and subcategories)

a communications module that coordinates communication ([0069], re: content management tool) between the one or more link directories ([0069], re: indexed knowledge base 38, which is used in conjunction with the content management tool), a user directory ([0057], re: user account on Website), ... , and the one or more client devices; (Fig. 1 # 16A) and

a user data store that stores information regarding authorized users of the client tool ([0041], re: indexed knowledge base 38 and supercategories) and

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

a database of user profile data

Chang, though, discloses:

a database of user profile data (Abstract discloses the use of a user profile)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Chang for the benefit of Goerz in view of Eddy, because to do so would allow a user to control the generation of links as taught by Chang in col. 8 lines 61-63. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Regarding claim 29, which is dependent upon claim 24, the limitations of claim 24 have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the one or more link directories comprise:

a link relationship table comprising a plurality of link relationship entries, the link relationship entries comprising:

a first field comprising a first link reference to a first document object of the link relationship;
a second field comprising a second link reference to a second document object of the link relationship;
one or more link relationship attributes providing information that places the link relationship in a context useful to the user; and
a directional indicator that indicates whether the link relationship between the first link reference to the first document object and the second link reference to the second document object applies in either direction or in both directions.

Eddy, though, discloses:

wherein the one or more link directories comprise:

a link relationship table comprising a plurality of link relationship entries, the link relationship entries comprising (p. 311, code listing 21-10):
a first field comprising a first link reference to a first document object of the link relationship; (p. 311, code listing 21-10 re: href="/regions/nyc.xml")
a second field comprising a second link reference to a second document object of the link relationship; (p. 311, code listing 21-10 re: href="/regions/li.xml")
one or more link relationship attributes providing information that places the link relationship in a context useful to the user; (p. 311, code listing 21-10 re: title="New York City") and
a directional indicator that indicates whether the link relationship between the first link reference to the first document object and the second link reference to the second document object applies in either direction or in both directions. (p. 311, listing 21-10 uses href to indicate link direction)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz and Chang, because to do so would enable a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by Eddy in the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Regarding claim 30, which is dependent upon claim 29, the limitations of claim 29 have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the directional indicator comprises a plurality of directional indicator fields, each directional indicator field corresponding to one of the one or more link relationship attributes and indicating whether the corresponding link relationship attribute applies in one direction or in both directions between the first link reference to the first document object and the second link reference to the second document object.

Eddy, though, discloses:

wherein the directional indicator comprises a plurality of directional indicator fields, each directional indicator field corresponding to one of the one or more link relationship attributes and indicating whether the corresponding link relationship attribute applies in one direction or in both directions between the first link reference to the first document object and the second link reference to the second document object. (p. 311, listing 21-10 uses a series of href assignments to indicate link direction)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz and Chang, because to do so would enable a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by Eddy in the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Regarding claim 31, which is dependent upon claim 29, the limitations of claim 29 have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the one or more link directories comprise:

a document object table comprising a plurality of link reference entries, the link reference entries comprising:
a network address of the document object on the network indicated by the link reference entry wherein the unique identifier for a document object is the network address of the document object; and
one or more document object attributes providing information that places the document object indicated by the link reference entry in a context that is useful to the user.

Eddy, though, discloses:

wherein the one or more link directories further comprise:
a document object table comprising a plurality of link reference entries (p. 311 listing 21-10), the link reference entries comprising:
a network address of the document object on the network indicated by the link reference entry wherein the unique identifier for a document object is the network address of the document object; (p. 310, code near bottom of left column ' href="http://www.eddygrp.com/bug.doc" ') and
one or more document object attributes providing information that places the document object indicated by the link reference entry in a context that is useful to the user. (p. 310, code near bottom of left column ' title="Bug Report 12/3/99" ')

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz and Chang, because to do so would enable a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by Eddy in the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Regarding claim 32, which is dependent upon claim 31, the limitations of claim 31 have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

*wherein the network address comprises a Uniform Resource Locator.
([0095], re: URL)*

Regarding claim 33, which is dependent upon claim 31, the limitations of claim 31 have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the link reference entries further comprise a listing of all link relationship entries in which the network address of the document object indicated by the link reference entry is present in the first field or the second field of the link relationship entries.

Eddy, though, discloses:

wherein the link reference entries further comprise a listing of all link relationship entries in which the network address of the document object indicated by the link reference entry is present in the first field or the second field of the link relationship entries. (p. 310 second code fragment in left-most column discloses a network address [www.eddygrp.com/bug.doc] of a document object. Where the address is stored in a record or data structure is irrelevant as far as patentability is concerned.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz and Chang, because to do so would enable a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by Eddy in the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Claim 34 is substantially similar to claim 32, and therefore likewise rejected.

Claim 35 is substantially similar to claim 32, and therefore likewise rejected.

Claim 36 is substantially similar to claim 32, and therefore likewise rejected.

Claim 44 is substantially similar to claim 5, and therefore likewise rejected.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed 4/8/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's remarks on pages 13-14 of the amendment concerning issues raised in the FAOM regarding the drawings, specification, and 35 USC 2nd paragraphs objections/rejections, as appropriate, have been addressed above (in which the Office withdrew these FAOM objections/rejections).

Regarding the FAOM rejections of claims under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goerz in view of Eddy, Applicant argues on pp. 14-15 that neither Goerz nor Eddy teach the recited limitations.

However, the Office notes that Applicant merely asserts that the Title (and CIP cross-reference) of the Goerz Published Application mentions the word "database". It is the cited passages, though, within the Goerz reference that need to be analyzed, and not the title (which was not cited). The Applicant appears to suggest that a reference must build exactly what the Applicant is claiming, when in fact a prior art reference is cited for the purpose of disclosing the claim limitation to which the cite is directed. Both Goerz and Eddy have been appropriately applied vice the Applicant's claimed limitations. The Office therefore substantially maintains

Art Unit: 2176

the rejections as presented in the FAOM of claims 1, 4, 6-13, 15-23, 26-27, 37-40, 43, 45-51 and 53-57 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goerz in view of Eddy.

Regarding the FAOM rejections of claims under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goerz in view of Eddy, Applicant argues on p. 15 that the rest of the claims fall because Goerz and Eddy are deficient.

The Office has addressed the arguments concerning Goerz and Eddy above. The Office therefore substantially maintains the rejections as presented in the FAOM of claims 2-3, 14, 41-42 and 52 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goerz in view of Eddy and in further view of Li and claims 5, 24-25, 28-36 and 44 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goerz in view of Eddy and in further view of Chang.

Conclusion

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2176

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert M Stevens whose telephone number is (571) 272-4102. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:00 - 2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven S. Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The current fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Additionally, the main number for Technology Center 2100 is (571) 272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Robert M. Stevens
Reg. No. 47,972
Art Unit 2176
Date: June 22, 2005


STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

rms